Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
MAR 19 1989
JOSEPH F. SPANIOL, JR.
CLERK

(3)

NO 88-1240

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

JONATHAN B. AINSWORTH

Petitioner

V.

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

Respondent.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

JONATHAN AINSWORTH
2237 S. Acadian Thruway
Suite 301
Baton Rouge, LA 70808
Telephone: (504) 923-0311

Petitioner
In Propria Persona

7 pp

NO 88-1240

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1988

JONATHAN B. AINSWORTH

Petitioner

V.

THE STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA

Respondent.

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

JONATHAN AINSWORTH
2237 S. Acadian Thruway
Suite 301
Baton Rouge, LA 70808
Telephone: (504) 923-0311

Petitioner
In Propria Persona

SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

Hassan Haschemi was an impostor and had no legal authority to hire anyone to represent Tchacosh, Siporex or Gashtowar in any lawsuit! See decision by the United State Court of Appeals in case no. 794932 RMT, Tchacosh Co., Ltd. v. Rockwell International Corporation 766 F.2d 1333.

The United States Court of Appeals upheld the opinion of the United States District Court in this regard. It held:

> "We hold, therefore, that at the time of divestment, Rockwell held no property or assets of Tchacosh within United States territory, and that the Government of Iran fully executed any acquisition of property or assets owed by Rockwell to Tchacosh arising from their subcontract within its own territory. Under the act of state doctrine, the Iranian decrees

> divesting Haschemi of authority to bring suit on behalf of Tchacosh will be given effect.
>
> Accordingly, the District Court's grant of summary judgment in favor of Rockwell is affirmed." (Id, at 1339 emphasis added)

In other words, Hassan Haschemi was an impostor! If the State Bar of California had any integrity at all, and was not merely concerned about its won-lost record, it would immediately dismiss its charges with regard to Hassan Haschemi and act in accord with the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit as well as the U.S. District Court in Los Angeles which granted summary judgment on the grounds that Hassan Haschemi did not have authority to bring the lawsuit in the first place.

If the State Bar were concerned with the truth, and not merely in protecting its won-lost record, it would immediately dismiss the Haschemi counts which took up 40% of the findings.

A grave injustice has been committed! Hassan Haschemi represented to Jonathan Ainsworth that he had authority to bring the lawsuit. He didn't. His own government had stripped him of that power. He misled Jonathan Ainsworth deliberately and without paying him for work performed. It would be a travesty of justice for him to prevail against Jonathan Ainsworth.

Compounding the matter further, Hassan Haschemi's attorney, who handled the above case when the Ninth Circuit wrote its opinion, perjured himself when testifying against Jonathan Ainsworth!


Instead of relating the true facts of the Ninth Circuit's and the district court's opinions, Mr. Miller falsely testified that Jonathan Ainsworth had caused Hassan Haschemi to lose the case. Attorney Miller perjured himself when he erroneously testified regarding the U.S. District Court Judge:

> "Judge Takasugi who is generally a very patient judge, lost his patience in this case and, quite frankly wanted to get rid of the case" (Transcript Vol. II, page 67, lines 17-19).

Since Stephen Miller was the primary witness against Jonathan Ainsworth in the proceedings below, his perjured testimony

had an enormous impact. The entire case should be thrown out. Absent a magnanimous act on the part of the California Bar now that it realizes the truth, the Supreme Court is respectfully requested to summarily reverse the judgment below and order that the State Bar of California pay all of petitioner's attorneys' fees and costs from the outset of the case to its conclusion, within thirty days of the filing of a cost bill by petitioner.

Respectfully submitted March 8, 1989.



Jonathan Ainsworth
Petitioner
In Propria Persona
2237 S. Acadian Thruway
Suite 301
Baton Rouge,
Louisiana 70808
(504) 923-0311